## EXHIBIT 6

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . Case No. 3:19-cr-00029-AET-1

ν.

402 East State Street Trenton, NJ 08608

GEORGE GILMORE,

Defendant.

January 18, 2019

11:01 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF INITIAL APPEARANCE AND ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE HONORABLE ANNE E. THOMPSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government:

Office of the United States Attorney

By: JIHEE GILLIAN SUH, AUSA 970 Broad Street, Suite 700

Newark, NJ 07102

Office of the United States Attorney

By: MATTHEW J. SKAHILL, AUSA

401 Market Street

4th Floor

Camden, NJ 08101

For the Defendant:

Marino Tortorella & Boyle, PC

By: KEVIN HARRY MARINO, ESQ.

437 Southern Boulevard

Chatham, NJ 07928

Audio Operator:

Kimberly Stillman

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311

Fax No. (609) 587-3599

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Remain seated. 1 THE COURT: All right. Who have we got here? On 2 3 behalf of the United States? MS. SUH: Good morning, Your Honor. Assistant U.S. 5 Attorney Jihee Suh on behalf of the Government. 6 MR. SKAHILL: Good morning, Your Honor. Assistant U.S. Attorney Matthew Skahill for the United States. 7 8 THE COURT: Very well. And across the aisle? 9 MR. MARINO: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Marino, Marino, Tortorella & Boyle for the defendant, George Gilmore. THE COURT: Very well. And you have the defendant 11 12 with you? MR. MARINO: Yes, I do, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. What do we have? We have an 14 indictment, do we? 15 MS. SUH: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. What does it charge and whom 17 181 does it charge? 19 MS. SUH: The indictment charges defendant George 20 Gilmore with six counts. Count 1 charges the defendant with the evasion of payment of taxes in violation of Title 26, 22 United States Code Section 7201 and Title 18, United States Code Section 2. 23 Counts 2 and 3 charges the defendant with filing 24 25 false tax returns in violation of Title 26, United States Code

1 Section 7206, Subsection 1, and Title 18, United States Code Subsection 2.

Counts 4 and 5 charge the defendant with failure to collect, account for and pay over payroll taxes in violation of Title 26, United States Code Section 7202 and Title 18, United States Code Section 2.

And Count 6 charges the defendant with making false statements in a loan application, in violation of Title 18, United States Code Sections 10, 14, and 2.

Your Honor, if I may proceed in advising the maximum penalties for the offenses?

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

:18

19

20

22

23

24

MS. SUH: For each of Counts 1, 4, and 5, the defendant faces a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum fine of \$250,000 or the greater -- the greater of \$250,000 or twice the pecuniary loss or gain from the offenses, and a supervised release term of three years.

For Counts 2 and 3, the defendant faces a maximum term of imprisonment of three years and a maximum fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain or loss from the offenses, and a supervised release term of one year.

For Count 6, the defendant faces a maximum term of imprisonment of 30 years and a maximum fine of \$1 million.

The information that the Government has establishes that Mr. Gilmore is a U.S. citizen. However, if he were not a

1 U.S. citizen, he's advised that conviction on any of the 2 charged offenses would subject him to immigration proceedings  $3\parallel$  and removal from the United States, and that he has the right to confer with the consulate of the country of which he is a 5 citizen. THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 6 71 Marino. MR. MARINO: Yes, Your Honor? 8 9 THE COURT: You've received a copy of the indictment 10 for your client, correct? 11 MR. MARINO: I have, Your Honor. THE COURT: And you waive the reading of this 12 13 indictment, is that correct? MR. MARINO: That is correct, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: And you would wish that I would enter 15 16 pleas of? MR. MARINO: Not quilty on all charges, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Very well. Not guilty pleas will be 18 entered with regard to all counts in the indictment. 19 Now the next matter would be a scheduling order. 20 MR. MARINO: If I may address that, Your Honor? 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 MR. MARINO: I have --23 THE COURT: Now we usually sign the scheduling order 24 25 at the time of an arraignment. Now --

MR. MARINO: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I understand that the two of you have talked and have not agreed on the schedule.

MS. SUH: Yes, Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MARINO: That is correct, Your Honor. advised the Government that Mr. Gilmore intends to enforce his rights under the Speedy Trial Act and wishes to be brought to trial by no later than March 29th, 2019 which is 70 days from today.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SUH: Your Honor, the Government is certainly willing to oblige and conform with the Speedy Trial Act and get to trial in this case as quickly as possible.

However, Your Honor, we think that it would be 15 premature and run the risk of setting an artificial trial date if we were to do so today. So what the Government would propose that we do today is set a schedule for the exchange of discovery and a status conference in short order, perhaps mid-February, and at that time, take up the issue of when the trial should be set.

There are a number of considerations, Your Honor, that would weigh in favor of following those procedures rather than setting a trial date now. First, Your Honor, the discovery in this case is extensive. Because it is voluminous, we actually proposed designating this case as a complex case,

but we were ready to prepare all -- prepare and produce all the discovery all at once rather than at stages. And we propose date of March 1st at first to the defense, but he opposed. And in light of what the defense has just explained, we're ready to accelerate that and produce it perhaps on February 8th is what we would propose and for the defendant's discovery to be produced a week later with Rule 12 notices.

Your Honor, the nature of the discovery, the large chunk of that discovery consists of subpoenaed records. The electronic size of those subpoenaed records alone is approximately 36 gigabytes. I'm advised by my IT department that that's at least 12,000 electronic files. The defendant's going to need some time to review that.

1.9

In addition, there will certainly be pretrial motions in this case and in limine motions. At a minimum, the Government will file a Rule 404(b) motion prior to trial. And shortly, we plan to make an application on the issue of Mr. Marino's simultaneous representation of the defendant and employees of the defendant's law firm.

Now that the defendant has been indicted and we're proceeding to trial with employees of the law firm that will be called as witnesses by the Government to testify at trial, we believe there's a conflict of interest that needs to be addressed by the Court and the issue of whether that conflict of interest is in fact waivable, as Mr. Marino asserted prior

7

101

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

7

to indictment, we believe that issue needs to be addressed and resolved by the Court prior to trial.

Your Honor, in addition, the defendant has raised a hoarding disorder as a possible defense. Now to the extent 5 that the defendant does proceed with seeking to raise that as a mental condition under Rule 12 that would be relevant to trial, we believe that there would be some motion practice related to that because the Government obviously would consider making a motion to have its own examination of the defendant by its mental health expert.

So given these considerations, Your Honor, we believe that today we should set the schedule for discovery and a status conference in short order and then take up the trial date later. We don't want to set a trial date now and inform civilian witnesses that that's the trial date only for it to be moved later and to do so before we've even exchanged discovery.

THE COURT: Your response, Mr. Marino?

MR. MARINO: Mr. Gilmore has been under investigation by the United States Attorney since August -- at least August of 2016 which is when we became aware of that investigation and when I was retained and began to represent Mr. Gilmore.

I much appreciate the Government's thought that I may need more time to prepare for a case that has been under investigation for that length of time, but I do not need it or want it.

. 8

Here's what I do want. George Gilmore is the republican chairman of Ocean County. He represents nearly every municipality in Ocean County. Since his indictment was announced, his clients and his colleagues in the Republican party have made it clear that they intend to stand behind him. This is a cloud that's been over his head for literally years, during which time, they have served subpoenas on every single client that the Gilmore & Monahan firm has.

They have looked high and low for evidence of political corruption. They have asked Mr. Gilmore, they've appeared at his home in August of 2016 where Mr. Mahoney of the United States Attorney's Office accompanied by a revenue agent of the Internal Revenue Service attempted to cua (phonetic) Mr. Gilmore into cooperating in some sort of political corruption investigation. Specifically telling him that there are — must be folks in Trenton that you know things about and you can help yourself and so forth, and so on.

We have had a forensic account review every single book and record in this case. We have met with the Government representatives on any number of occasions. I have spoken with representatives of the Department of Justice enforcing our right to be heard before this indictment was handed up.

We have absolutely no desire for any extension whatsoever. Motions in limine, meaning motions at the threshold are considered in every case. They don't have

anything to do with upsetting the Speedy Trial schedule.

1

2

3 |

6

7 |

81

9

10

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

9

Earlier this week, I received an e-mail from Mr. Skahill and Ms. Suh in which they identified this provision of 18 U.S.C. Section 31(c) (sic). And Your Honor will be well 5 familiar with it. Section (h)(8). And they say, first of all, under (h) (7) that they believe this is a case which should be continued. And the factor they identify is Number -- (B) (ii), whether the case is so unusual or so complex due to the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by this section.

The number of defendants in this case is one. nature of the prosecution is a straightforward tax case, not -on most of the counts, not for evasion per se but for a willful failure to pay those taxes Mr. Gilmore indicated in his filings that he in fact owes.

It is -- and there's a bank fraud count which is not complex or unusual in any way either.

The notion that there are novel questions in fact or law? No, there are not. And that it is unreasonable to expect preparation? No, it is not. We've been preparing for this case since August of 2016. They could have brought it at any time they wished. They didn't have to bring it last week.

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

10

They could have brought it next month. They could have brought it next year. They chose to go now. They have these documents.

Ms. Suh says, without apparent irony, that there are documents from financial institutions and so forth. 6 those documents. Surely, she's not suggesting that they would employ the grand jury to gather evidence for use at that trial. We know that's improper and that's not something they ever engage in. I've been doing business with their office for three decades.

So what we're talking about is, is Mr. Gilmore going to be ready to go? Yes, he is.

The hoarding disorder that we have raised, I have 14 made my expert report available to them. I have told them that they could interview my expert if they wish to do so. told me that they read the report and they were unimpressed. They believe that it does not negative (sic) any element of the offense. I quite disagree with them.

But if they want to have their witness examine Mr. Gilmore, they should have their witness examine Mr. Gilmore. I'll make him available.

I don't intend to move to dismiss any part of their 23 misbegotten indictment because I intend to either get a judgment of acquittal at the conclusion of their case or to get an acquittal outright at the conclusion of the trial.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11||

131

15

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

11

They have all the cards until today. Today, the first appearance, I get to say, put up in 70 days or the case 3 gets dismissed. If they're not ready to go in 70 days, they  $\parallel$  should dismiss the case. If they are ready to go in 70 days, we should go in 70 days. I'm entitled to that. So no, I don't want to wait.

First of all, the suggestion is three more weeks to get discovery they obviously have in their possession. What are we waiting for?

I don't want to wait to let them decide whether they want to make the typical motions such as a 404(b) motion. a motion in limine, made at the threshold of every trial. has never affected the timing of any trial I have ever been involved in in my entire career.

So I want to go forward. Mr. Gilmore wants to go forward. He should not be made to suffer the pain of this investigation for one day longer than the United States Congress says a person accused by a grand jury ought to be made to suffer. And that's why we want to go forward.

So all that business about heavy duty discovery and all these gigabytes and motions in limine, all meaningless.

Now, yes, I have written waivers from each one of the people they hailed before the grand jury over the course of the last two years. Some of them went -- surely, some of them went in 2017, many of them. And some in 2018. I don't perceive any

1 difficulty or problem with that whatsoever. They have written 2 waivers. If they want to raise that on a motion in limine, 3 they can raise it on a motion in limine.

In terms of substantive motions that would -- that 5 this Court would have to have under consideration for some 6 protracted period of time, there will be none. I will make 7 none. There indictment states a claim on which relief can be 8 granted. Their indictment states a crime. Whether they can 9∥ prove that crime is a whole other thing. And I'm ready to go with them. In fact, I will tell Your Honor, I can be ready to proceed the first week in February.

So if they want to wait, they pulled the trigger, now it's time to put up. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Suh, yes?

4

12

13|

14

15

17

19

21

22

23

24

MS. SUH: Your Honor, I don't believe that there's 16 much disagreement actually. I appreciate Mr. Marino's zealous advocacy for his client, but the Government's position is that we'll be ready to proceed. We're not asking for an extension. All that we're proposing is, let's take this step by step, set the schedule for discovery, have a status conference, and at that time, select a trial date. That's all we're proposing. We're not asking for an extension.

And obviously, we dispute Mr. Marino's position with respect to the conflict issue. And that's why we believe that we'll need to address that with the Court. We'll file a motion

on that. I'm sure he'll respond.

1

2

71

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

But the scheduling order should allow some time for And we could do that very shortly, this month. But what 3 that. 4 we're mainly proposing is that let's set the discovery 5 schedule, set a short status conference in short order, and 6 then take up a trial date instead of setting an artificial one now.

We have no opposition to trying this case within 70 There's -- however, there's a sensible sequence in days. getting there. And that, first for the defendant to review the discovery, to receive it, and then to talk about pretrial motions and set a schedule for them.

THE COURT: Well, here's the problem. He's asking for what the statute provides, and that's a trial within 70 days. And if that's what he wants, what's that March the --

MR. MARINO: March 29th would be the 70th by my count, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, that would be a Friday.

MS. SUH: Friday, Your Honor.

And we could certainly begin jury THE COURT: selection and start the trial on the 29th.

That would be my pleasure, Your Honor. MR. MARINO: And I believe the Court is right about that. 23

> THE COURT: And I have no problem setting that date. MR. MARINO: Yes.

THE COURT: But here's the problem. Be seated both of you.

MR. MARINO: Thank you, Your Honor.

1

2

3

51

11

13

15 ll

17

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: The problem is that on the one hand, Mr. Marino is asking for that date. The Speedy Trial Act was  $6\parallel$  enacted to protect the defendant's rights. The processes which the Government has listed are really provisions to assist the defendant. The opportunity -- have a seat. The opportunity to have full discovery, an opportunity to consider pretrial motions, some of them may become more evident as time, preparation elapses. All of that is really for the benefit. It's not for the benefit of the Government.

The Government obviously has gotten the indictment. So they've already got the materials. It's the defendant who doesn't have everything. So it's a way of -- in a way, it's handicapping the defendant, not the Government at all.

But if the Government -- if the defendant is seeking a date of the 29th of March, I'm quite satisfied the Court would be ready to try the case. It doesn't matter to the Court as long as we're not in trial with something else. And I don't anticipate being in trial with something else on the 29th of March. So that's fine with me.

MR. MARINO: If I may be heard just --

THE COURT: But it's the -- have a seat. 25 the protections for the defendant that are the concern here,

1 the recusals and the conflict matter that seems to me -- this 2 is January 18th, it seems to me that the Government can be 3 ready with that in two weeks, I would think, to address that. 4 And all those other considerations, really, are for the benefit of the defendant, not for the benefit of the Government.

5 |

6

7 I

8 II

10

12

13

15

16

17

181

19

20

21

22

23

24

And --

So I agree with Ms. Suh that it seems to be a date that is not realistic. Just looking at the substance of the indictment, it would seem that it would certainly take longer to prepare. But the Court is quite satisfied to go on March 29th if the parties are ready or if the defendant is ready. I'm sure the Government could be ready. They've admitted that they could go on the 29th.

So let's short circuit this. We'll set the date for the 29th of March which the defendant has requested.

MR. MARINO: May I be heard, Your Honor? I actually did not request the 29th. I requested that that be the very last date. So I'm prepared to go before the 29th. I just want that to be clear for the record. And you know --

> THE COURT: Well, we have to have a date, Mr. Marino. MR. MARINO: Yes, I think we have to have a date.

THE COURT: Now would you like to give me another date that you would like to -- as your trial date?

MR. MARINO: Your Honor, here's -- it's this simple from my perspective. I don't have a problem with the 29th if

that's the date that the Court wishes to set. I just wanted to 2 point out that I really do want Mr. Gilmore to be tried within the 70 days.

THE COURT: Promptly. You want him to be tried promptly.

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

25

resolved.

MR. MARINO: I do. And I'll tell you this --

THE COURT: I understand. I sensed that.

MR. MARINO: Yes. And I'll tell you this as well, this issue about the waivers of these other individuals, yes, I represented those individuals pursuant to written waivers. also produced each and every one of them to be submitted to the grand jury. So they've testified in the grand jury. I'm more than confident that whatever lingering issue they may have about putting some of these witnesses on the stand can be

I'll tell you, I think there also will be many things that can be stipulated to. I'm not sure they quite understand how we intend to proceed here. But my quess is as often happens in these cases when you have responsible folks on both sides, they sit down and they say, well -- for example I'm going to want to introduce all of these records. need to bring someone into authenticate them? experience, typically no. If there's something to talk about, we'll talk about it.

But other than that, I don't intend, in other words,

1 to put any unreasonable impediment, any impediment at all in 2 their way. If there is documentation from these financial 3 institutions, I don't see any reasons to have a custodian for  $4\parallel$  example come on and authenticate the document. Your Honor has 5 been through this drill many times and I a number of times as 6 well.

So the idea that -- I understand and appreciate the Court's indulgence. And of course it's for the defendant's protection. Of course. But my thought is if Your Honor sets a 10 date -- and it can be whichever date within now -- between now and the 29th of March that is workable for the Court. And there comes -- becomes some -- it if becomes clear during the course of that time that there needs to be more time, I assume that they will ask for that. I don't envision asking for it myself, but --

THE COURT: Well, you can't --

7

131

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

MR. MARINO: You cannot foresee everything that might happen. But I do believe that if you set it for that day and with a resolve to actually go forward on that day, we'll do everything in our power to make certain that that happens.

I wouldn't want to be in a situation where Your 22 Honor's on trial with another matter and then it gets kicked for a period of time. And I understand the Court is very busy obviously. And we have this looming business of a government shutdown. I know that the U.S. Courts, at least according to

1 its website have made clear that criminal cases will be 2 respected and will go forward and so forth. But you know 3 that's obviously another thing that's sort of looming in the background.

4 |

5

71

-81

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

181

19

20

21

22

23

So I just -- if Your Honor wants to set it for the 6 29th, that's fine. If you want to set it for a date prior to the 29th, that's fine too. I expect that we will be ready to go in very short order. And I want to keep the pressure to produce all these things in a timely fashion and to move forward on it.

THE COURT: I think if we say the 29th, Mr. Marino, that will keep the pressure on everybody.

MR. MARINO: That's fine with me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It takes a long time to get these cases ready. And you know that better than I. So --

MR. MARINO: Your Honor, I will tell you that I tried a case in October of 2014 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. And I will tell you that when I arrived at the arraignment and said the very same things I'm saying to Your Honor in that case, which I will tell you was far more complex than a simple tax case such as this, the Government said, all these things. It sounds very magnanimous, we want to make sure the defendant is ready to go and so forth. And Judge Liam O'Grady said, you indicted the case, you've got 25 to be ready to go in 70 days.

2

41

5

61

71

9|

10

11

131

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

19

And I will tell you, I met my client for the first time on July 14th. And he was on a plane home, acquitted by 3 order of the Court on October 23rd because we tried that case in accordance with the Speedy Trial Act.

They don't like it because in the normal course, they take forever to get the case ready to go. Then they indict it. And then they take forever to get the trial ready to go. that's not what the United States Congress says the defendant is entitled to. That's what I'm reacting to.

So I know it takes a long time. And I know that the Speedy Trial Act in a sense is honored in the breach because everyone sort of thinks, well, I have of other cases and there's a lot going on and, hey, we all really need time. Well, when your reputation hangs in the balance, you don't want time.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand. And it's a serious matter. And I'll make sure that the Court is ready to receive you on the 29th of March. So we'll set that as the trial date.

> MR. MARINO: Thank you very much, Your Honor.

MS. SUH: And that's fine with the Government, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now in dividing up the time between January 18th and March 29th, shall we set dates which would be realistic for discovery -- for motions if there are to

20 be any and so on? 2 MR. MARINO: That would be the defendant's pleasure, 3 Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Let's see if we can do that 4 5 II right now. Can you make a proposal? You've got your list of 6 things that are anticipated. Maybe I'll give you five minutes so I don't have to be here for that. You can take five minutes and see if you can work out a realistic schedule between now and March 29th. And I'll be back in five minutes and we'll 101 order them. 11 MS. SUH: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Your Honor. 12 MR. MARINO: 13 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. (Off the record) 14 15 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Remain seated. 16 THE COURT: All right. What do we have? Any 17 agreement as to chopping up the time period between now and March 29th? 181 19 MR. MARINO: We have spoken, Your Honor. And we 20 haven't reached --21 MR. SKAHILL: Your Honor, if I could -- if I --22 THE COURT: Everybody's talking at the same time. 23 All right. I should decide who I'm going to listen to. MR. SKAHILL: Your Honor, if I could be heard? 24

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from the

25

Government, then I'll hear from you, Mr. Marino.

1 ||

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. SKAHILL: So Judge, we do not have an agreement. 3 And what we proposed and what we think is eminently reasonable 4 in this case is to provide discovery by February 8th.  $5\parallel$  we can be clear on this. And Mr. Marino referenced a 6 continuance order and a scheduling order that we sent over. Judge, the --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Let me see if I understand what's going on.

MR. SKAHILL: Yes.

THE COURT: You providing discovery on your part --

MR. SKAHILL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- entails what?

MR. SKAHILL: So what we intend to do, Your Honor, there is --

THE COURT: I mean it's not a matter of just opening a door to a room and letting them come in?

MR. SKAHILL: It is not, Judge. tremendous amount of discovery in this case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SKAHILL: And as Ms. Suh put on the record, approximately 36 gigabytes. We're going to provide the discovery electronically. It includes hundreds of responses from subpoenas.

THE COURT: So what does that require you to do?

That's what I want to know.

1

2

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

181

19

21

22

24

25

MR. SKAHILL: Three weeks of time, Your Honor, to  $3\parallel$  Bate stamp stuff, organize it, catalogue it and put it on a hard drive to send over. We think that's reasonable, Judge.

And to be clear, when we had initially talked about  $6\parallel$  designating this case as complex, we never forced it on Mr. We sent him a proposed continuance order for consideration due to the volume of material in this case.

He doesn't think it's complex. That's fine. But we have a considerable amount of stuff to turn over, Judge. And I understand his -- he has stood up and said, this case has been going on for years --

THE COURT: Well, you see, maybe he doesn't want all that. I mean he's entitled, if he wants, to go to trial with less than what you -- with less that a perusal of what you have if that's his choice.

MR. SKAHILL: Understood, Judge. But we want to make sure we're complying with the Rule 16. If he doesn't want the discovery, we won't give him the discovery, but we want to comply with the rule and provide it. To comply with that rule and ensure it's turned over in a fulsome way, we think for a case with these counts, with this nature, that three weeks is 23 reasonable.

MR. MARINO: If I may be heard very briefly, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Just not yet. Not yet. I have to understand what counsel for the Government is saying. You have to Bate stamp and organize evidence now?

MR. SKAHILL: Judge, I should --

MR. MARINO: Thank you.

1

31

4

5

6

71

111

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

MR. SKAHILL: Judge, evidence is organized, but we want to make sure it's provided in a way that's usable for Mr. Marino. We don't want to just take files and stick them on a disk and just turn them over. If he wants it that way, we could do it faster. But we want to make sure that it's in a format that's usable to him. We want to make sure -- we want to do a check of things to make sure that you know proper redactions are done. We can provide this in a quick turnaround, but for the amount of stuff here, we don't think three weeks is an unreasonable amount of time.

THE COURT: You mean three weeks before you would invite him, is that what you're saying?

.MR. SKAHILL: We could invite him in earlier, Judge, but we want to provide the stuff on a disk to him so he can 20∥ just have it.

MR. MARINO: I don't understand what's going on. Ι just want to be heard.

THE COURT: Mr. Marino, now let's go step by step. 24 Let the Judge try to understand first, then you can understand.

MR. MARINO: Fair enough, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: So you're saying that you won't be ready 1 to turn over discovery 'til when? Now this is January 18th. 2 MR. SKAHILL: Judge, we propose February 8th. 3 Court asked -- we can move faster than that, Judge. We thought 4 that was a reasonable date. We could do it --5 THE COURT: All right. Well, he wants a fast track. 6 MR. SKAHILL: Yes, he does. 7 THE COURT: All right. So how soon can you provide 8 the open door for him with whatever it is that you would consider he's entitled to have if he wishes to look at? MR. SKAHILL: Judge, I think we could start rolling 11 stuff out to him next week, if we did things on a rolling 12| basis. I think we could --13 THE COURT: So you could conclude by when? 14 MR. SKAHILL: I think we conclude everything by 15 February 8th, Judge, but we could probably -- if I could look 16 at my calendar, Your Honor? February 1st will be two weeks I think we could be concluded by February 1st. 18 from today. That's 14 days, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. So you can make everything 20 available for him that he's required to -- that he's entitled 21 to by February 1st. That's two weeks from today. 22 MR. SKAHILL: I believe we could do that, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Now what other milestones do we have? 24

MR. SKAHILL: In terms of --

25

THE COURT: -- defense motions. But he's not concerned.

MR. SKAHILL: No, Judge. What we had proposed, there is a conflict issue.

THE COURT: Oh, there's some motions that you wanted to make?

MR. SKAHILL: Yes, Judge. We raised a conflict We proposed to file that motion. Your Honor said in two weeks we could do that. That would also be February 1st, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. February 1st for the Government's motions, conflict motions.

MR. SKAHILL: Yes, with a response by February 8th and a reply by February 15th.

THE COURT: Fine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

MR. SKAHILL: And we had proposed any other pretrial motions that Mr. Marino wishes to file by March 1st.

THE COURT: Well, we'll let him take a date for that 19 because we won't -- well, no. All right. We'll give March 1st for Mr. Marino.

MR. SKAHILL: And Judge, I should also say there would be obviously any reciprocal discovery that Mr. Marino has, if we're providing by February 1st, we'd ask that he provide by February 1st as well. As well as any Rule 12 25 notices that he may have.

26 THE COURT: Two weeks. 1 MR. SKAHILL: Two weeks from today. 2 MR. MARINO: Judge, whenever Your Honor is --3 convenient for Your Honor --4 THE COURT: Yes, when I get to you, yes. All right. 5 6 Fine. MR. MARINO: I just want to make certain these dates 7 8 aren't being set in stone yet. 9 THE COURT: Right. MR. MARINO: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: All right. Anything else that you would 11 need? This 404(b), what was that? You think you're going to 12 | have 404(b) material that --131 14 MR. SKAHILL: I think we will, Your Honor. We'd ask 15 them ten days before trial. 16 THE COURT: Well, you've allowed yourself plenty of time for that. Okay. Ten days before trial. All right. 171 else? What other milestones do we have? 19 MR. SKAHILL: We would also, Your Honor, need to set 20 a pretrial conference. I don't know if it's premature at this point to pick a date for that. Obviously, if there's motions filed, we will be back in front of Your Honor. But if we're 22 going to have that March 29th trial date, we will need a pretrial conference before then to address trial related

25

issues, Judge.

27 THE COURT: Well, what about March 15th, two weeks 1 before trial starts? 2 MR. SKAHILL: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 Is there anything else that the THE COURT: 4 Government needs? 51 MR. SKAHILL: I don't believe so, Your Honor. 61 think that addresses the issues. 71 8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Marino. 9 MR. MARINO: Thank you very much, Your Honor. THE COURT: Now what would be workable for you, given 10 today to March 29th? 11| MR. MARINO: In the first place, I can't imagine why 12 20 percent of the time that the United States Congress says a 13 defendant has before he will be brought to trial at most, I can't understand why 20 percent of the outside number would be 15 devoted to work that could have, and should have, and perhaps was going forth? 17 THE COURT: Yes, and it's too late for that. 18 19 can't --20 MR. MARINO: I want to come in and look at the room full of documents today or Monday. I don't need them to put a 21  $22\parallel$  bow around it for me. I don't need them to do any of this. THE COURT: Well, they want to Bate stamp it. 23 want to put it on disks. So they want to make it so that you

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

25

can take it with you.

MR. MARINO: And that would be great, but --

THE COURT: And you don't have to sit in the room and absorb it all at once.

MR. MARINO: The problem is --

THE COURT: Yes?

8 II

11 |

MR. MARINO: -- if they were going to make it available to me electronically right now, that would make sense. But they're going to eat 20 percent of my time.

THE COURT: That would be preferable.

MR. MARINO: I just want to go -- they can do that. They can give it to me. I don't need it electronically until February 8th or 1st or whatever it is. That's fine. But I'd like to be there looking at their documents as soon as humanly possible. I'd like to go there this afternoon and begin to look at them for example.

I don't -- you know these are bank records. I can tell you they're -- 36 gigabytes and so I can look at those documents and satisfy myself without perusing them as to what they are and what they could possibly contain that would inimical to my defense and my client's interest.

So yeah, it's great that they want to give it to me in a bow and do all of that. That's wonderful. And they can do it, and I'll take it on February 1st. Great. What I'd like to do is, I'd like the opportunity to go to the United States Attorney's Office at some time next week at the Court's

direction, whatever you think makes sense, and look at the room for just -- you can see, okay, this stack of documents, for example, these are all bank records for Mr. Gilmore from this account. Great. Okay. Put those to one side. You know and get through it all.

So that's -- that actually enables me to prepare my defense. That's what's in my mind. Not waiting 20 percent of my time so they can send me 36 gigabytes and I can begin wading through it then. That's why that's a problem. And so you know

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right. Mr. Marino, I'm not going to set times or even discuss with you what afternoons or mornings you're going to go to the U.S. Attorney's Office. I'm going to set a date. And I agree with you that the Government has had everything all the time. But I will give them two weeks, February 1, I don't consider that unreasonable, as their time for providing discovery to you. That's just two weeks. So we've moved -- we'll move beyond that.

MR. MARINO: On the conflicts motion.

THE COURT: Yes?

51

6

81

10

11

14

16

17

181

19

20

21

23

24

MR. MARINO: What I tried to do with the break was obviate the motion practice all together. So just to bring Your Honor quickly up to speed, I told them --

THE COURT: But they want to do something in motion 25 practice with regard to conflict.

30 1 MR. MARINO: I asked them what they wanted. THE COURT: And so -- well, whatever it is --2 3 MR. MARINO: Well, because they --4 THE COURT: I'll see it when it's in writing. 5 I'm not going to argue with you now --MR. MARINO: They intimated that --6 7 THE COURT: -- as to whether they can -- the merits 81 of it. 9 MR. MARINO: They intimated that they may seek my disqualification as Mr. Gilmore's counsel. I told them what --11 let's -- what is the conflict that needs curing? You could have gone, at the time you signed the waivers and I represented these people when they went to the grand jury, you could easily 13 have made an application at that point if you felt that there was a disqualifiable or unwaivable conflict. They made no such 15 application. I've been representing the man literally for more 17 than a year since then. But I have said to them, if you think it's somehow 18 19 going to advantage Mr. Gilmore or what have you to have me represent those people, I will today seek to have another 21 lawyer represent them. I'm not -- I'm trying to clear away the underbrush 22 23

I'm not -- I'm trying to clear away the underbrush because I think -- maybe I'm wrong about this, but I think and always thought when the case goes to the grand jury and you get that indictment, that's when you, the Government, are ready to

go.

1

2

4

5

61

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

THE COURT: All right. Just a minute. Mr. Marino, when do you want as a date? Did we nail down the date for this conflicts issue?

MR. SKAHILL: February --

THE COURT: All --

MR. SKAHILL: February 1st, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. All right.

MR. SKAHILL: And I'd appreciate if we could file the 10 | motion, not have Mr. Marino try to litigate now. We've raised this issue with him. He's indicated he thinks it's a waivable conflict. We would like to file the motion, Your Honor. may be waivable, but we think it needs to go before the Court.

It is --

THE COURT: You'll be able to file your papers by February 1st?

MR. SKAHILL: Absolutely.

THE COURT: All right. Fine. Conflicts, February 1. 19∥ Now what about defense discovery? Do you think you will have anything to provide, Mr. Marino?

MR. MARINO: I have provided them with discovery 22 before they went to get the indictment. I gave them all the 23 photographs of Mr. Gilmore's hoard of property. And I gave them Dr. Simring's (phonetic) report. And they're well familiar with Dr. Simring since he testifies for them.

THE COURT: All right. So you don't think you have anything --

MR. MARINO: Not that I'm aware of.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

1

2

3

4

5

71

9

10

13

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

MR. MARINO: But the moment one -- a piece of discovery becomes available that they're entitled to in the way of reciprocal discovery, I'm very familiar with Rule 16 and with my obligations. And I will comply to a --

THE COURT: By what date?

MR. MARINO: Well, I don't think there's anything right now, but if Your Honor sets a date of the 8th of February, that's fine.

THE COURT: All right. Fine. February 8th for defense discovery under the rule. All right. Now what about motions that you might want to file, Mr. Marino? Give me a date. Pretrial motions that you might want to file.

MR. MARINO: I think our pretrial motions can be filed by -- well, I should ask the Court, I don't want to -let me just say, other than motions in limine, I don't believe I have a motion to file, other than motion in limine. And motions in limine, I would expect to be filed in the few days before trial.

But in terms of pretrial motions, I'd like to know what Your Honor -- Your Honor's pleasure is because I don't 25 want the pendency of the motions to affect the trial date.

25∥ made to the Court, it's -- I know this is part of our local

rules here and certainly it's been part of my practice forever, to try to resolve the motion if it can be resolved before putting it to the Court. So I'd like to try to resolve whatever issue they have with respect to conflict. And it would be certainly in Mr. Gilmore's interest, and I believe in the interest of the Court and the Government as well for that issue to be resolved as quickly as possible.

3 |

5 II

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

17

19

21

22

23 l

24

Obviously, all the people we're referring to testified in the grand jury to my understanding. And so we have grand jury transcripts. I'm told, I'll get this transcripts. And certainly if I were to represent Mr. Gilmore at trial, which I well intend to do, I would be cross examining these people based upon what statements they have.

Other than that, and Mr. Skahill has observed that he certainly doesn't expect me to deviate from the rules of professional conduct. And I wouldn't think this Court would expect that either. So I don't know if they are serious about wanting to try to disqualify me from the case, I would suggest they ought to do that right now because if that's what's going to happen and he's going to have his Speedy Trial rights, he should get another lawyer today, okay?

If they're not going to do that and they don't want me represent these people, they think it's unseemly or what have you, if they're going to be witnesses, I'm happy to refer them to another lawyer. Their -- my representation of them

3

61

7 |

8

9|

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 consisted in presenting them at Mr. Skahill's behest to testify in the grand jury and debriefing them after that testimony.

So I suspect when I receive the grand jury testimony,  $4\parallel$  I will have probably a better account of what occurred than I 5 was able to get in my debriefing interviews right after they came out of the grand jury room. But I'd like to resolve this issue.

I'd like obviously to have -- to avoid the motion. And the reason to avoid the motion is really because, honestly, 10 undue work for everybody.

THE COURT: I understand. I understand.

MR. MARINO: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Obviously, if lawyers can resolve an issue that is a dispute, a fundamental dispute such as this, without the Court being involved, that's fine. And judges only expect to be consulted when the parties are not able to resolve it themselves.

If there's to be a motion to disqualify Mr. Marino, understandably, that should be resolved as quickly as possible. Will you be able to prepare and -- can we stick with the March 1st date for that, if it's to be in writing?

MR. SKAHILL: February 1st, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

Yes, February 1st. MR. SKAHILL:

THE COURT: The February 1st date.

MR. SKAHILL: We will adhere to that date, Judge. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. If it can be resolved before 3 then, fine. If it's to be on paper, then the due date is 4 February 1st, two weeks from today. That's fine. 5 MR. MARINO: Thank you. 6 THE COURT: All right. Anything else that the Court 7 l -- bail. 8 MS. SUH: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: What's the bail issue? 10 MS. SUH: Consistent with pretrial services' recommendation, the Government's position is that the defendant be released pending trial on an unsecured bond amount of \$250,000 and the standard conditions of pretrial release as set 14 forth in their report. 15 MR. MARINO: We've reviewed the report, Your Honor, 16 and have no objection to those conditions. 17 THE COURT: Very well. So ordered. What about the 18 passport? 19 MR. MARINO: It has already been provided to pretrial 201 services, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Very well. 22 MR. MARINO: And Mr. Gilmore has also agreed to an 23 reporting arrangement with pretrial services. 24 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you. Anything else to be taken up in this matter?

38 MS. SUH: Nothing further from the Government, Your 1 2 Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Marino? 4 MR. MARINO: Not for the defense, Your Honor. 5 you very much for your time this morning. I guess it's late 6 for breakfast. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. 9 10 11 <u>CERTIFICATION</u> 12 I, VIDHYA VEERAPPAN, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the 15 above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability. 16 17 18 /s/ Vidhya Veerappan 19 VIDHYA VEERAPPAN J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: January 23, 2019 21 22 23 24 25